



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*Social England: A Record of the Progress of the People in Religion, Laws, Learning, Arts, Industry, Commerce, Science, Literature and Manners from the Earliest Times to the Present Day.* By Various Writers. Edited by H. D. TRAILL, D.C.L. Vol. I: To the Accession of Edward I. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1894. — 504 pp.

When we have been giving for two or three years much of our thought to the maintenance of an unpopular scientific position, and then suddenly and unexpectedly learn that one of the *dii majores* of scholarship, to whom we have been accustomed to look up, has decisively taken his stand on the same position — life has few moments of less alloyed satisfaction! Some such feeling as this the reviewer had when, turning over the collection of papers — excellent, good and indifferent — which Mr. Traill has got together, his eye lighted on two or three sentences such as these from the pen of Mr. York-Powell :

[Of Roman Britain] The arable fields were neatly tilled, mostly in the Roman fashion, on the three-field course . . . Along the roads, at intervals of a few miles, stood neat and comfortable country houses, after the Italian fashion, each with its farm and corn fields tilled by slave or serf labour. [Page 121.]

[After the English Conquest] the slaves and bondmen seem to have lived and worked precisely as they had for their former masters. [Page 122.]

The German theory, formerly generally accepted, that free village communities were the rule among the English, seems to have little direct evidence to support it. The English conqueror found estates cultivated by British *servi* and *liberti* and *coloni*, according to certain rules and customs, for the profit of the *dominus* and *patronus* and their own living. He stepped into the Roman patron's or even the earlier Celtic chief's place, exacted his dues and farmed more or less after his fashion. [Page 125.]

That the greater number of the upper classes of Roman or British blood were either expelled or slain is likely throughout the country ; but that the land was continuously tilled in the same fashion, and chiefly by people of the same stock, from the time when the Romans came to the time of Henry VIII, now seems pretty certain. [Page 132.]

To hint at conclusions like this, — not to state them dogmatically, but to venture to put forward facts which seemed to point in this direction, — was to bring the *Saturday Reviewer* down upon us, but a short time ago, as “anti-German iconoclasts.” Now that one of the few men in England who really knew much from the original

sources of Old German life has finally thrown "the German theory" overboard, perhaps the time has come for the temper of orthodoxy to give way finally to the temper of science.

In the opinion of the present reviewer this will be the main result of Mr. York-Powell's pronouncement. It will help to clear the air; it will render more possible the discussion of the fundamental question at issue without exacerbation. But it is hardly a new or positive contribution to the discussion. Mr. York-Powell adduces no fresh data: and his one new argument, which is that the facts of the English language show that it is to a great extent "the tongue of one people spoken by another," he brings no evidence to support. It is to be hoped that the battery of criticism will induce him to work out the lines of argument, philological and other, that have led him to his conclusions.

It must be confessed, indeed, that the time has not yet come for the positive reconstruction of early English social history; and Mr. York-Powell's own attempt is far from being completely satisfactory. The two crucial questions would seem to be these: What became of the rank and file of the English invading hosts? and what was the relation between the "small" freeman of early English times and the open-field system? Mr. York-Powell answers the first question in this wise:

A stretch of country would be marked out into lots according to the number of *vills* or estates, and these lots would be dealt out by hazard in some hallowed and accustomed fashion among the conquerors—the leaders of the newcomers taking several shares, and *a small knot of brothers or kinsmen counting as one allottee* . . . Two or three homesteads for the English yeomen and gentlemen, and some dozen or score of rush-thatched wattled cots for their British serfs and bondmen housed the stock and labour that worked the land that had belonged to the deserted *villa* of a Roman landlord. [Page 123.]

Much as the present writer is inclined to agree with Mr. York-Powell as to what probably took place, he cannot help saying that in the first place this is all pure speculation (none the worse for that, if only it be remembered), and in the second place there is a broad gap between this and the practically complete manor of the tenth century pictured in the *Rectitudines*—which the writer quotes a page or so further on as if it described much the same thing. The second question, the relation between *status* and the open field system, Mr. York-Powell does not attempt to touch.

The reviewer must plead in excuse for the apparently disproportionate space here given to one of the papers in the volume, that the question which is involved is so fundamental that no clear thinking is possible on early English constitutional or social development without some sort of preliminary conception as to the position of the mass of the people. That the insistence on its importance is often regarded as almost fanatical, but shows how little clear thinking there is.

And now, as the volume is one which is sure to pass through several editions and to be very generally consulted, it may be useful to call attention, not to its merits, which are many, but to a few defects which may be removed upon revision. The poorest work in the book is to be found in the sections on "Social Life and Manners," by Mr. P. H. Newman. In knowledge and judgment it is not, perhaps, inferior to a good deal of historical journey-work that passes muster: it is its association with superior work that reveals its poverty. In style, however, it is susceptible of a good deal of improvement. On page 221 is a passage to which it is hard to assign a meaning: "The king's prerogatives were considerable: he had . . . the power of summoning the witan, and they with him framed the laws. *It is worthy of remark that his word was taken without oath.*" This is curiously reflected in many of the laws referring to witnesses"; and then the writer proceeds to quote from that erudite work, the "Report of the Royal Commission on Market Rights," a couple of passages from the Saxon laws, apparently in blissful ignorance of the existence of Thorpe or Schmid. Some fatality dogs the sections on "Social Life" in this volume, even when they are anonymous: for when we come to the chapter on the period 1066-1216 we find Holinshed solemnly quoted at great length as, apparently, an altogether reliable authority for the ecclesiastical troubles of the twelfth century (*e.g.*, page 335).

Passing now to the sections that are worthy of serious criticism as to their matter, here are a few *dubitanda*, greater or lesser:

Page 75: "These *collegia* . . . from whom the trade corporations of the middle ages may be said, without much straining of language, to be descended. . . ." One would like Mr. Hughes, the writer of this, to say in what sense he uses "descended": he is no doubt aware that, so far, we have been unable to prove the continuous existence of a single *collegium* into the middle ages proper.

Page 125: Mr. York-Powell makes the *cotsetla* of the *Rectitudines* "unfree." Economically, doubtless he was: but one understands

that the term is here used in the sense of legal status ; and if so, how are we to interpret the clause concerning the *cotsetla* in the *Rectitudines*: "eal swâ ælcan frigean men gebyreth"?

Same page: "The *Village Council* to settle matters of unjust trading and the common tillage and pasture, he [the new English lord of a *villa* group] presided at"—comes oddly after a sentence which tells us that he "stepped into the Roman patron's place," and sounds like an unconscious survival from Mr. York-Powell's earlier convictions. The only evidence for an early Saxon village moot is to be found in the alleged "archaic" features of the village of the later middle ages: and a village moot is hard to fit into the writer's own picture, before quoted, of the "two or three homesteads" of the English "yeomen," and the "dozen or score of cots" for the British serfs.

Page 136: "At first the king of the English would go round with his proposed laws to the several folk moots, getting the separate consent of each." The only support for this, so far as I am aware, is Athelstan 3; and that is hardly sufficient.

Page 138: "To watch the king's interests there was another local freeholder of the better sort, *chosen by his fellows, often at the king's nomination, as scir-gerefa or sheriff.*" What is the evidence for this? Is it not a part of the imaginary democratic golden age which people used to find in Saxon times? And do not the first five words of the sentence make it somewhat improbable?

Following Walter of Henley, the *hide* on page 123 is made 180 acres on the three-field system, and 120 on the two-field. On page 238 we are told by the same writer that it was always "an ideal of 120 acres." As Mr. Round has already pointed out, either of these views is intelligible; but they are difficult to harmonize. While we are mentioning inconsistencies, apparent or real, we may, perhaps, ask Mr. A. L. Smith to compare his own utterances on page 207 about the "usual food," with what he says on page 357 about wheat.

The volume is full of repetition, not altogether explained by the extenuating plea of the editor, but caused to a great extent by the unduly large number of contributors. There is very little feeling of proportion in the editorial arrangement, which has placed what are really considerable treatises on architecture by the side of the briefest generalizations on fundamental social institutions. It is to be hoped that in future volumes the editor will see his way to redressing the ill-proportion; that he will be able to induce his abler con-

tributors to write at greater length, and that he will allow them a freer hand. Meanwhile, students of social history are grateful for what they find in this first volume: and especially for the fascinating pages of Professor Maitland on jurisprudence, the freshness and independence of Mr. York-Powell, the conservative caution of Mr. A. L. Smith, the sober judgment of Mr. Richards on Roman civilization, Mr. Poole's scholastic lore and Mr. Owen Edwards's pro-Celtic enthusiasm.

W. J. ASHLEY.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

*Philanthropy and Social Progress.* Seven Essays by Miss JANE ADDAMS, ROBERT A. WOODS, FATHER J. O. S. HUNTINGTON, PROFESSOR FRANKLIN H. GIDDINGS and BERNARD BOSANQUET. With Introduction by Professor HENRY C. ADAMS. New York, Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1893. — 268 pp.

*Bibliography of College, University and Social Settlements.* Compiled by M. KATHARINE JONES. Philadelphia, The College Settlements Association, 1894. — 19 pp.

*Forward Movements.* Containing Brief Statements Regarding Institutional Churches, Social Settlements, Rescue Missions. Boston, W. L. Greene & Co., 1894. — 47 pp.

The announcement by Columbia College of its plan for sociological field work at the University Settlements emphasizes anew the importance of the settlements to students of social science. To the sympathetic observer they offer unrivaled opportunities for the study both of social conditions and of various methods of amelioration. Moreover, the settlement movement is now considered of such importance in contemporaneous social history that libraries are making special collections about it, and bibliographies of the subject are being prepared.

In *Philanthropy and Social Progress* the principles and methods of the settlements are set forth by two leading spirits of the movement, Miss Jane Addams, of Hull House, and Mr. Robert A. Woods, of Andover House. Miss Addams contributes the first two chapters, on the "Subjective Necessity" and "Objective Value" of settlements. In the first she analyzes the motives which lie behind the movement. First, there is felt to be a need to extend democracy beyond political forms to the whole social organism, if democratic government is to be a success. In a democracy it is impossible to establish a higher political life than the people desire; but the